Berlin, and Prof. Stade at Giessen, all read courses on Old Testament Introduction. Prof. Dillmann adds a special course on "History of the Text of the Old Testament."

Professors Delitzsch and Dillmann also lecture on "Isaiah" during the winter, as does Prof. Duhm of Göttingen. Genesis will be expounded by Professors Richm, at Halle, Baur of Leipzig, Stade of Giessen, and Kleinert of Berlin. Besides his Assyrian studies, Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch of Leipzig will discuss Deuteronomy, to which book Prof. Kuenen, the recent Hibbert lecturer, will devote his lectures in the University of Leyden. At Leipzig, Dr. Ryssel lectures on the Psalms, and at Berlin they are discussed by Dr. Strack. Old Testament Theology claims the attention of Riehm at Halle, König at Leipzig and Duhm at Göttingen. Besides these theological lectures, there are the usual philological courses in the cognate languages, Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, Assyrian. One may judge how thoroughly Semetic studies may be pursued in Germany by learning the amount of time and labor devoted by the Faculties to this branch. At Leipzig, for example, no less than eight lecturers are employed, whose courses, mostly two hours a week, never more than four hours, fill sixty hours a week.

QUESTIONS ÷ AND ÷ ANSWERS.

[Questions of general interest, relating to the Old Testament and to the Hebrew Language will be published in one number of The Hebrew Student and the answers to these questions will be published in the succeeding number. It is expected that the answers as well as the questions shall be furnished by readers of the journal. The initials of the interrogator and of the answerer will be appended in each case. Readers are requested to forward to the Editor questions which may occur to them from time to time, and answers to such questions as they may see proper to consider.]

NEW QUESTIONS.

23. How may the Dāghēsh-forte in נָאֶשְׁמוּ Joel I. 18, be explained? W. W. L.

24. By what process has עָנָה *to sing, answer,* become עָנָה *to oppress,* or vice versa? C. P.

25. Will you explain the origin and significance of the terms "Mǐl'ēl" and "Mǐlrǎ"? S. F. H.

26. Is there in existence a *thorough, critical, devout,* or at least non-skeptical, *accurate* commentary on the book of Exodus? S. F. H.

27. What is the best book showing the influence of the Hebrew language and literature upon modern thought? A. B.

FORMER QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

12. Why does לַמְנַצֵּחַ occur in the Psalms sometimes with and sometimes without a Mĕthĕgh under the ל?

Not sometimes, but in *all* places where the word is formed, there appears the Mĕthĕgh under the Lāmĕdh. At least it is so in the editions of Baer, Letteris, Heidenheim, and all others who have been careful and conscientious in these *minutiæ.*

In some editions, e.g., in Buxtorf's Biblia Rabbinica, etc., the Mĕthĕgh is omitted; the editors no doubt, considering this sign as too insignificant an affair, and as something self understood.   B. F.

13. How is the word יְרוּשָׁלַ͏ִם to be pronounced ?

The correct pronunciation (Qᵉrî) is *Yᵉru-sha-la-yim*. The Kᵉthîbh, the spelling without a Yōdh after the Lāmĕdh is prevailing in the Bible. According to the Massorah on Jer. 26, 18 the spelling without a Yōdh is only five times to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures. From the Kᵉthîbh we may conclude that in ante-Christian times the name sounded evidently *Yᵉrushalem*. Comp. also *Shalem*, the elder name of the city,   Gen. 14, 18 ; Ps. 76, 3 ; and *Yᵉrushᵉlem*, the Aramaic form, found several times in the book of Ezra.   B. F.

14. What is the meaning of the inverted Vāv (Nûn) which occurs several times in Ps. 107 between the 22nd and 28th verses ?   F. W. B.

[*We have received a long and interesting reply to this question, but for lack of space defer its publication until the next number.*]

15. Why is the vowel-notation throughout Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar made to differ from Webster, Worcester, or the authorities ?   T. M. B.

The Hebrew vowel-system is unique. Everything depends upon the tone or accent. The shifting of the tone causes certain vowels to be shortened, others to be lengthened. Yet not *every* vowel is subject to changes. Those which have risen by *contraction* are unchanged. It is only those which have been made *long* by the tone, that may be made short by it, e. g., בֵּין *between* is contracted from בַּיִן (a+y=ê), but בֵּן *son* is lengthened or heightened by the tone from בֶּן. The former is unchangeable, the latter changeable. These vowels, though they have the *same sound*, differ (1) in their origin, and (2) in their character. It is necessary, therefore, if we desire to keep before our minds these differences, to transliterate them by different signs. What signs shall be used is a matter of choice. By common consent ê is used to indicate the former, ē the latter. The vowel-notation of Webster has to do with neither the origin or the character of a given vowel, but solely with the sound. Hence the impracticability of adapting one system to the other.   R.

15. How can we account for the remarkable similarity in the order of words in Hebrew and English prose ?   B. F. W.

[*No satisfactory answer to this question has as yet been received. Will not some one examine it ?—Ed.*]

17. Is there any periodical published in pure Hebrew ?   B. F. W.
[*See the article by Dr. Henry Gersoni in this number, pp. 113–116.*

18. What is the difference in meaning between בֵּין מַיִם לְמַיִם and בֵּין מַיִם וּבֵין מַיִם ?

These word combinations appear in Gen. 1, 6–7. In the meaning of the same there is as little difference as there is in their English translation : "*between the waters and the waters.*" and : "*between the waters* (which were under the expanse) *and between the waters* (which were above the expanse)." There is no real differ-

ence at all. The Biblical authors use indiscriminately לְ....בֵין, or וּבֵין....בֵין, or בֵין....לְבֵין.   B. F.

The construction with לְ may be explained by the originally substantive character of the preposition—"space between," "interval;" so literally, "In the intervening space of the waters [which lies] *in the direction of* the [other] waters. In Isa. 59, 2 there is a blending of the two constructions בֵּינֵכֶם לְבֵין אֱלֹהֵיכֶם. "Between you and your God."—*Mueller's Hebrew Syntax,* § 53, R, *a.*

19. It is said that Vāv Conjunctive which comes to stand before a tone-syllable, may be pointed with pretonic ‗. This is the case in וָבֹהוּ (Gen. 1, 2). Why not also in וְחֹשֶׁךְ ?

Because בֹהוּ has a disjunctive accent, a Zākēph qatōn, and וְחֹשֶׁךְ has a conjunctive accent, or at least one of a smaller disjunctive potency, a Ṭĭphḥā. Similarly : וָאָרֶץ (Gen. 47, 13), because of a Mûnāḥ, and וָאָרֶץ (Gen. 14, 19, 22), because of a Sĭlluq ; וָדוֹר (Gen. 15, 16) with a Mēr⁽khā, and, and וָדוֹר (Deut. 32, 7) with an Athnāḥ. However no uniformity must be expected. We meet many accented syllables with a R⁽bhîa⁽, or a Păshṭā, or another disjunctive accent, and yet the preceding Vāv conjunctive has a Sh⁽vâ, It is in such small matters the same with ancient as with modern authors. We would not ask even a Macaulay, Why did you put here a comma, and in another sentence of the same grammatical construction, a semicolon ?   B. F.

20. In how far are the Massoretic points a commentary on the text ?

We will illustrate it by an example. Suppose we had the English consonants *m n r s* before us, and we should try to read them by adding vowels ; what would be the result of these attempts ? A might probably read, miners ; B, minors ; C, man, rise ! D, men rose ; E, mean ruse ; F, main rays ; G, many rows ! H, miner, say ! I, minor, see ! and so on. The Massorites who flourished in the seventh or eighth century, had such a consonant-text before them, to which they affixed vowel-signs and and accents. Though in the main they were familiar with the traditional reading of the Jews, which, in general, ought to be considered as a correct and reliable one, yet in some instances they may have misunderstood and misinterpreted the old consonant-text, and in consequence thereof they may have wrongly divided the letters into words and verses, and may have vocalized the words wrongly. For example : Deut. 33, 2, מִימִינוֹ אֵשְׁדָת לָמוֹ. The Massorah reads the middle word אֵשׁ דָּת (from his right hand there was *a fire law* for them). Some modern critics, among them very conservative ones, prefer with good reasons the reading אֲשֵׁדֹת (at his right side there were *slopes* (or *ravines*) for them).—Another example : In Ezra 10, 3, the emendation of the Massoretic reading אֲדֹנָי (the Lord, God) by אֲדֹנִי. (my Lord, meaning Ezra) is a good one, and very probably it restitutes the original intention of the author. The following may give an illustration of wrong dividings of the letters, ישועותפניואלהי (Psalm 42) is by the Massoretic, so divided that יְשׁוּעוֹת פָּנָיו conclude verse 6, and אֱלֹהַי begins verse 7. But it gives a more lucid sense if we end verse 6 by אֱלֹהַי and divide the words thus : יְשׁוּעוֹת פְּנֵי וֵאלֹהַי. This reading is more-

over supported by the concluding words of the same Psalm 42, and the next one, Ps.
43. In the foregoing the correctness of the Massoretic text as to the consonants
has been pre-supposed; but in regard to the letters too, emendations in several
passages are fully justified.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　B. F.

[*The answers to Numbers 21 and 22 are held over to the next number.—Ed.*]

Bᴏᴏᴋ✢Nᴏᴛɪᴄᴇѕ.

[*All publications received, which relate directly or indirectly to the Old Testament,
will be promptly noticed under this head. Attention will not be confined to new books;
but notices will be given, so far as possible, of such old books, in this department of study,
as may be of general interest to pastors and students.*]

ARYO-SEMITIC SPEECH.*

Is there a relationship between the Aryan or Indo-European languages, and
the Semitic? If a relationship exists, can it be demonstrated? What is to be
regarded as the criterion of relationship? These are fundamental questions in
the science of language. To be sure many eminent philologists maintain that all
discussion of these questions must prove fruitless, but this is by no means certain.
As our author says, "the field should not be abandoned until inquiry should be
proved to be a search for the undiscoverable, or, in other words, until true scien-
tific methods should be proved to be unavailing." The history of the treatment of
this subject furnishes, we feel assured, the explanation of its present disrepute.
Perhaps no question in the whole domain of the science of language has been made
so ridiculous in the hands of those engaged in its study. The view that Hebrew
is the parent of all other languages we ourselves have heard defended by learned
divines. The author gives us briefly but clearly the various views held upon this
subject. The theories of Bopp, Lepsius, Gesenius, Fürst, Franz Delitzsch, Ewald,
Meier, Rudolf von Raumer, Ascoli, Friedrich Delitzsch and Grill are taken up and
criticised in turn. It is interesting to note that besides the names just mentioned,
the following scholars favor the doctrine of the possibility of a relationship:
Eugene Burnouf, Max Müller, Pictet and Steinthal. The most pronounced
opponents of this view are Pott, Schleicher, Renan, Friedrich Müller, and Sayce.
The second chapter of the volume discusses the criteria of relationship, "sounds,
structural principles, and the contents of the vocabulary," while in the third chap-
ter the Aryan and Semitic alphabets are reduced to their primary limits, and the
result of the investigation is given in the form of a list of Proto-Aryan and Proto-
Semitic consonants. The fourth chapter is occupied with that most interesting
question, the *formation of roots*. This of course includes a discussion of the pecu-
liar "biliterality" of Semitic roots. Concluding this chapter with a "scheme of
possible and actual root-forms in Proto-Aryan and in Proto-Semitic," he proceeds

---

*Aryo-Semitic Speech: A study in Linguistic Archaeology, by James Frederick McCurdy.
Andover, Mass.: W. F. Draper. pp. 176. Price $2.00.